AJO DOMESTIC WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Ajo Domestic Water Improvement District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 12, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Jennifer Allen, Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Vice Chair Rex Scott, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 5:19 p.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

Arizona Water Company, to provide an agreement for the operation and maintenance of water distribution system to ensure continued water services to customers in the Town of Ajo, no cost/2 year term (SC2600000078)

It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Allen stated that the contract was for the operation of the Ajo Water Improvement District and that the County was in the process of selling the domestic water improvement district. She stated that the domestic water improvement district had been managed by volunteers in the community for many years and they were ready to pass it on. She stated that it had taken a lot of work to get to this point and she expressed gratitude to staff and to the lawyers who had negotiated the agreement.

Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, stated that this had been more complicated than staff had thought it would be, and he thanked the volunteers and Ajo for their continued work.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **CONTRACT**

Ajo Domestic Water Improvement District and Pima County, to provide a Non-Exclusive Right-of-Way Use License for Public Utility Facilities, no cost/25 year term (SC2600000077)

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

____
CLERK

LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD MINUTES

The Pima County Library District Board met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 12, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Jennifer Allen, Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Vice Chair Rex Scott, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 5:19 p.m.

1. **CONTRACT**

Off Duty Management, Inc., Amendment No. 6, to provide Tucson Police Department special duty services for library customers and amend contractual language, Library District Ops Fund, contract amount $210,000.00 (SC2400001422) Administering Department: Library District

It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy stated that since September of 2022, out of the sole source procurement process, the Procurement Director had approved an award of $250,000.00 which was then extended. He stated that in June 2023, they exceeded the amount another $192,000.00 through the procurement process and then awarded another $250,000.00 in June 2024, and another $250,000.00 in April 2025. He stated that the award was over $1 million for Tucson Police Department (TPD) off-duty officers to guard Pima County libraries and staff. He asked why they used TPD officers and not Pima County Sheriff’s Department (PCSD) deputies. He stated that they heard about issues regarding homelessness, crime, drug addiction and mental health in both the City of Tucson (COT) and County, as well as had research on why there were those incidents of violence, homeless camps, and people on the street and that the County had its own dire situation with the library system where they had to provide protection to the public and staff and asked why he had not heard about it in the reports from the homeless, substance abuse and mental health experts. He stated that the County had a problem in the libraries and no one had addressed it. He asked why this was not addressed and included in the problem of homelessness and violence.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that not all of the libraries were in unincorporated Pima County, some were located in the COT and they used off-duty police officers in those locations. She stated that they also used different individuals to protect libraries. She stated that about $250,000.00 a year was spent to address issues at the libraries so that people who came to the libraries felt safe in those facilities.

Supervisor Christy stated that they could find the money to protect their libraries with TPD off-duty police officers, even though the County owned and operated the libraries, however, he questioned why they were shorthanded and short staffed on the city streets to protect residents.

Ms. Lesher explained that the County also used Vet-Sec which provided security services in their buildings to employees and the public who came into their facilities.

Chair Allen stated that she understood the library had conducted an extensive review of incidents at their libraries and this was a result of that review, and that the report was available. She stated that it was not that the issues were not known or that no one was talking about them, but the item was a direct response to that library assessment.

Steve Holmes, Deputy County Administrator, concurred. He stated these libraries were within the COT limits and that they hired TPD officers within the COT for the issues associated with some of the concerns that had been echoed by staff at those locations. He stated that it was based upon a needs assessment and it was brought forward as a procurement process. He stated that he could not answer to TPD's other shortages, but these were off-duty officers who were assigned after their general work hours and were not pulled from their current duties.

Supervisor Christy stated that he had seen PCSD deputies who stood in front of Walmart as protection, and he did not think the jurisdictional matter was as important since the libraries were the same to Pima County as the deputies were to Pima County. He stated that his issue was that they had a problem with safety in the libraries and while they could address it with money, he questioned why that same amount of money could not be directed to address the overall crime problem they had. He stated that the discussion had not included the incidents they had at libraries and that when he talked to staff and constituents, they were terrified even with protection. He stated that it seemed odd to put the libraries in a special place and the rest of the citizenry had to suffer from bad situations with criminals.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

____
CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING MINUTES

The Pima County Board of Supervisors met in regular session at their regular meeting place in the Pima County Administration Building (Hearing Room), 130 West Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona, at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 12, 2026. Upon roll call, those present and absent were as follows:

Present:	Jennifer Allen, Chair *Dr. Matt Heinz, Vice Chair Rex Scott, Member Steve Christy, Member Andrés Cano, Member
Also Present:	Jan Lesher, County Administrator Sam E. Brown, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Melissa Manriquez, Clerk of the Board John Stuckey, Sergeant at Arms

*Supervisor Heinz joined the meeting at 5:19 p.m.

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT**

The Land Acknowledgement Statement was delivered Bonnie Schock, Executive Director, Fox Tucson Theatre.

3. **PAUSE 4 PAWS**

The Pima Animal Care Center showcased an animal available for adoption.

4. **PERSONAL POINT OF PRIVILEDGE**

Supervisor Christy paid tribute to the passing of community leader Fred Boyce. He stated that he was a longtime Tucson civic leader, rancher and champion of higher education who passed away on May 5, 2026, at the age of 96. He stated that Mr. Boyce had been an influential community leader in the community who served on the Arizona Board of Regents, Tucson Airport Authority, Tucson Medical Center's Board of Trustees, numerous nonprofits and civic boards, and he served as President of the University of Arizona Foundation and was a founding member of the Tucson Conquistadores. He stated that he was born in Pasadena, California in 1930, and raised in Tucson after his family moved in 1937, attended Sam Hughes Elementary, Mansfield Junior High and Tucson Senior High School, and that ranching became central to his life and at age 11 began spending summers working on an Arivaca cattle ranch which launched a lifelong career in the cattle industry. He stated that Mr. Boyce moved to LA to attend Occidental College where he earned his bachelor's in economics before moving back to Arizona to cattle ranch full-time. He stated that he started the American Cattle Company and later served as President of the Arizona Cattle Growers Association and on the Executive Committee of the National Cattlemen's Association. He stated that Mr. Boyce's civic involvement made him one of Tucson's most respected leaders behind the scenes and in 2002, Governor Jane Hull appointed him to the Arizona Board of Regents and during his tenure he advocated for expanding access to affordable higher education and became the first regent to serve two consecutive terms as board president. He stated that he served on the Arizona State Parks, Junior Achievement of Tucson and the Tucson Metro Chamber and in 2017 the Greater Tucson leadership honored him with the Founders Award for his civic contributions. He stated that Mr. Boyce was survived by his wife of 73 years, Ann, had requested no memorial service, and that contributions in his memory could be made to the University of Arizona Foundation. The Board observed a moment of silence in his memory.

Supervisor Cano welcomed Herminia Frias, Council Member of the Pascua Yaqui Tribe and thanked her for her many years of service to the people of Pascua Yaqui and to Pima County.

5. **CURRENT EVENTS/PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Chair Allen indicated that the National Letter Carriers Annual Stamp out Hunger Food Drive was held on Saturday, May 9, 2026. She stated that it had started in 1993 and grew into the nation's largest one day food drive that helped fill the shelves of food banks throughout the United States. She stated that the 32nd Commemoration of the 1984 Genocide against the Tutsis in Rwanda would take place at Grace to the Nations on May 17, 2026, to honor the memory of over one million lives lost and to renew the collective commitment to peace, unity and justice. She stated that District 3 office hours for Picture Rocks would be held on May 20, 2026, from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., at the Picture Rocks Community Center, and that her staff member Bonnie Bazata and Tom Drzazgowski, Deputy Director, Development Services, would be there to answer any questions regarding zoning and other issues in the Picture Rocks area.

PRESENTATION/PROCLAMATION

6. Presentation of a proclamation to Melanie Bustamante, Apraxia Kids Volunteer, proclaiming the day of Thursday, May 14, 2026 to be: "APRAXIA AWARENESS DAY"

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Scott and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item. Supervisor Scott made the presentation.

7. Presentation of a proclamation to Annette Leyva, Tribal Administrator, Pascua Yaqui Tribe; Catherine Demotica, Program and Volunteer Manager, Arizona Diaper Bank; Felicia Leon, Tucson Unified School District - Native American Services; Magdelina Verdugo, CEO, Victor Bowleg, Program Manager and Lindsay Terry, YWCA, proclaiming the week of May 12 through May 18, 2026 to be: "PERIOD POVERTY AWARENESS WEEK"

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item. Chair Allen made the presentation.

8. Presentation of a proclamation to Anna Harper, CEO, Emerge; Dr. Felina Cordova, Assistant Professor - Health Promotion Sciences, University of Arizona; Veronica Boone, Wellness Director, Tucson Indian Center; Marcelino Flores, Tribal Liaison, Pima County Health Department; and Rosa Alvarez, Council Member and Secretary, Pascua Yaqui Tribal Council, proclaiming the month of May 2026 to be: "HOPE, HEALING, AND SOLUTIONS MONTH FOR MISSING AND MURDERED INDIGENOUS PEOPLE"

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item. Chair Allen made the presentation.

9. Presentation of a proclamation to Courtney Slanaker, Director, RedCross; Fatima Luna, Chief Resiliency Officer and Karina Martinez Molina, Community Relations Coordinator, City of Tucson; Nate Young and Betsy Camara, Program Managers, and Harrison Brown, University of Arizona BRACE Intern, Pima County Health Department, proclaiming the week of May 11 through May 15, 2026 to be: "HEAT AWARENESS WEEK"

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item. Supervisor Cano made the presentation.

10. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Trista DiGenova addressed the Board regarding misconduct in the Pima County Sheriff’s Department and an alleged illegal raid in 2023 on her home. She also spoke about her campaign for the Pima County Board of Supervisors and the Pima County Sheriff.

Patricia Bauere spoke about the banning of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) activities on local properties and urged the Board to ban immigration concentration camps in their jurisdictions. She indicated that ICE and the federal government were violating constitutional rights.

Cory Stephens urged the Board to remove Sheriff Nanos from office over allegations of dishonesty and misconduct. She stated that others in their fields would be subject to consequences for lying or unethical behavior and questioned why similar accountability had not been applied to Sheriff Nanos.

Ray Suarez, Flock Tucson, shared his concern on the expansion of AI surveillance cameras in Pima County and warned about privacy risks and lack of oversight. He raised concerns about data sharing with ICE and urged the Board to hold a public town hall on the issue.

Laurie Moore questioned the sovereignty of the democrats on the Board for their support on immigration and asked whether voter identification requirements verified citizenship.

Bruce Wheeler stated that removing Sheriff Nanos from office would undermine the democratic process by overturning the will of voters who elected him. He stated that he had supported Sheriff Nanos' opponent, Mark Napier, but he urged the Board to let voters decide the Sheriff's future.

Paula Cortes addressed the Board regarding her son, Jonathan, who had died after being released from jail without the treatment transfer required by his probation plan. She blamed staffing shortages and failures within Pima County Adult Probation for leaving vulnerable people without support after release.

Reed Spurling voiced his opinion on the Board supporting data center projects that worsened water shortages, fossil fuel use, and heat-related harms in the region. He supported recent protests against Lazarus & Silvyn and accused local officials of prioritizing developers over residents.

J.P. Salvatierra stated that the Board failed to properly review and scrutinize election canvassing procedures related to the 2026 RTA measures. He spoke against politically motivated actions involving Sheriff Nanos and about the neglect of Human Resources procedures.

* * *

Chair Allen closed Call to the Public.

Chair Allen stated that she wanted to understand the use of flock cameras within the County, and she had been told that the County did not have them, but she wanted to know if they did and to what extent. She also requested additional information from staff regarding the young man with adult probation and why the hand off had not happened in the way it was supposed to.

FRANCHISE/LICENSE/PERMIT

11. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Heather Anderson, Mountain View High School, 3901 W. Linda Vista Boulevard, Tucson, May 19, 2026, from 8:30 p.m. - 8:40 p.m. (Senior Sunset Celebration)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

12. **Hearing - Fireworks Permit**

Lisa Perez, Walden Grove High School, 15510 S. Sahuarita Park Road, Sahuarita, May 21, 2026, from 9:00 p.m. - 9:05 p.m. (Graduation)

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Scott and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Heinz voted "Nay," to close the public hearing and approve the permit.

13. **Hearing - Liquor License**

Job No. 389686, Birendra Chaudhary, Quick Mart, 4611 N. Flowing Wells Road, Tucson, Series 10, Beer and Wine Store, New License.

The Chair inquired whether anyone wished to address the Board. No one appeared. It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to close the public hearing, approve the license and forward the recommendation to the Arizona Department of Liquor Licenses and Control.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

14. **Hearing - Building Code Text Amendment**

<u>P26TA0001, BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION CODE UPDATES</u>
An Ordinance of Pima County, Arizona; relating to building and construction; adopting by reference the 2024 International Energy Conservation Code with local amendments; and amending Chapters 15.04 and 15.14 of the Pima County Building Code to reflect the Code adopted by reference in this Ordinance. (All Districts)

If approved, pass and adopt: ORDINANCE NO. 2026 – <u>6</u>

It was moved by Supervisor Cano and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to adopt the Ordinance. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy stated that the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SAHBA) provided a letter to the Board and the President and CEO had made two distinct comments about this particular item, and one stated that they had concerns about the compliance costs of the new code at a time when affordability challenges were already significant. He stated that they were willing to work with the County to address any unintended consequences to mitigate cost impacts, while achieving goals of energy efficiency. He indicated that the letter directly stated that compliance of this item would result between $1,500.00 and $2,600.00 additional construction costs. He stated that Oro Valley estimated that the cost could run as high as $6,000.00 to $9,000.00 per home and that this type of regulation made the housing situation unaffordable and caused the enduring housing crisis. He stated that he would be voting against this ordinance amendment.

Supervisor Scott stated that following up on Supervisor Christy's comments, he appreciated the opportunity to talk with Mr. Godlewski from SAHBA about the concerns of his members. He thanked Mr. DeBonis for the conversation he had with him prior to the study session about this item and appreciated hearing how the County and the City of Tucson (COT) worked collaboratively on these codes, but also the dialog that occurred between officials within the County's department, with the representatives from the Towns as well as Marana, Sahuarita and Oro Valley. He stated that Mr. DeBonis and Mr. Ice were present and they had conversations with Mr. Godlewski and their leadership with SAHBA as to how County staff would work in collaboration with their membership to address some of their concerns. He asked if staff could address how that collaboration with SAHBA and its members would look operationally.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, explained that he had a conversation with Mr. Godlewski and that the joint code committee between the County and the COT was very conscious of the issue of costs and energy efficiency in their buildings, both residential and commercial. He stated that committee indicated that they would continue to hold dialog around the implementation of these changes so that they could hear input from stakeholders and could evaluate whether any subsequent changes were necessary, and in addition, there were a variety of forums that existed. He stated that County staff, including Mr. Ice, the County's Building Official and Deputy Director with Development Services, participated in the technical committee meetings of SAHBA, and the County Administrator and the Deputy County Administrators met with executive leadership of SAHBA. He stated that there were a variety of official meetings and Mr. Ice met with the building officials of the other jurisdictions on a regular basis. He stated they had a stakeholder development industry meeting that included SAHBA and the Metropolitan Pima Alliance and other industry professionals that identified issues and worked to address them collaboratively. He stated that he indicated to Mr. Godlewski that they would continue to use all those channels and any others that were helpful to track the implementation of the amendments. He stated that in Ms. Lesher's memorandum dated May 11, 2026, it noted that there were a series of questions received from Board offices, particularly around the commercial provisions and some of the sections that were not recommended for adoption and an interest in evaluating whether or not those thresholds for applicability, for commercial structures, were appropriately sized. He stated that the recommendation was to ask the Board to direct staff to initiate additional discussions with the Tucson/County Joint Building Code Committee, and to have some input from the Pima County Climate Action Executive team as it related to that matter on the commercial provision. He reiterated that there were a number of forums where this dialog could continue and they had a long and productive relationship with the home builders and the development industry of understanding the impacts of things that were being proposed and adopted and working to address those in a collaborative and comprehensive way.

Supervisor Scott stated that he appreciated the conversation the Board had prior to the study session about the fact that the Towns of Marana, Oro Valley and Sahuarita often wanted to assert their own concerns and their own needs, and that sometimes being engaged in decisions where the influence of the much larger City or County could have an effect on their focus on those needs and concerns within their jurisdictional boundaries. He stated that moving forward, in the interest of regional consistency, he hoped that the COT and the County could look for more ways to reach out to the towns. He stated that in two of those towns, they would be seeing a significant amount of growth and one of them might be built out more than the other two. He stated that the County was already working in partnership with regard to their needs to increase housing stock at the affordable workforce and market rate level and he felt there should be more efforts for regional collaboration in these arenas as well.

Chair Allen thanked the Tucson/Pima Joint Code Committee and the Pima County Planning and Zoning and Development Services for their work to bring this before the Board. She stated that her office had paid close attention to the energy code as it moved along through the process and because one of the lessons learned in the last year was that there were very few ways that the County could have a direct impact on energy usage and emissions in the broader community. She stated that the Board had recently approved the Climate Action Plan for County Operations that helped them reduce waste in the systems and reducing costs and environmental impact, but impact outside County operations was really limited. She stated that the building code, especially the energy code, would become a portion that the Board would be considering. She stated that it was the primary and best tool for them to be able to move the needle on reducing County-wide energy use and emissions. She stated that they had concerns and had brought this forward and discussed this with Development Services. She stated that one concern was the change made that exempted buildings under 50,000 square feet from complying with additional energy efficiency credits and load management requirements. She stated that if this standard was applied to the current building stock, that would mean that 80% of buildings would be exempted. She stated that the International Energy Conservation Code recommended that these codes apply to buildings that were 1,000 square feet or greater. She stated that their second concern was that there was the complete removal of sections related to on-site renewable energy installation, energy use monitoring and automatic receptacle controls. She stated that taking the climate crisis seriously meant that they also had to take seriously opportunities like these that could have a real impact on how much energy was used in County buildings and the emissions that they produced. She stated for clarification that the new standards would not apply to existing buildings but only for new construction and she did not like framing of cost versus climate but they needed a code that was practical and strong enough to reduce energy use, lower long-term costs, and support better building stock over time. She stated that they had heard when the Board discussed their 2026 heat plan, they discussed the climate plan. She stated that one of the greatest calls her office received was around people struggling to pay for their utilities, placing attention in energy code within their building codes would make a difference. She stated that it was better to be up front around energy efficiency and reducing energy use and emissions so that people were not bearing that cost down the road. She stated that the COT had already adopted the energy code, but there was interest among some members of the council to address these same concerns that her office had shared.

A friendly amendment to the motion was made by Chair Allen, to approve the Ordinance and request, as noted in the memorandum from the County Administrator, for staff to reconvene the Tucson-Pima County Joint Code Committee to address these two specific concerns and bring amendments back to the Board within 120 days.

Supervisor Heinz seconded the friendly amendment, but asked if they could be brought back in 180 days.

Chair Allen stated they could, although 120 was a time frame that was acceptable and delineated in the County Administrator's memorandum.

Supervisor Cano asked if the motion and the friendly amendment adhered to Administration's belief that they could both adopt the code as presented and could come back to the Board with additional recommendations.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded yes.

Supervisor Cano accepted the friendly amendment as the maker of the original motion.

Upon the vote, the motion, as amended, carried 4-1, Supervisor Christy voted "Nay."

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

15. The Board of Supervisors on April 21, 2026, continued the following:

2026 Regional Transportation Authority Special Election

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the After-Action Reports prepared and presented by Pima County's Recorder and Elections Director, and/or designee, to include, but not limited to, addressing the new voting system implemented, as well as the deployment of the "Votemobile" during the special election period. (District 4)

(Clerk's Note: See the attached verbatim related to this item.)

This item was for discussion only. No Board action was taken.

16. **County Administrator Hiring Process**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the County Administrator Hiring Process. (District 3)

Chair Allen stated that the job post was live and several individuals had applied. She thanked her colleagues for putting forward ideas for individuals to serve on the community search committee, that the County Administrator's Office had sent out letters inviting them to be part of that committee and a rough timeline was shared with them. She stated that a more detailed timeline would be shared with the Board at the next meeting and there would be an opportunity for questions and engagement for other folks across Pima County in the community.

This item was informational only. No Board action was taken.

17. **Support of Rio Nuevo**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 26, of the Board of Supervisors, supporting the continued authorization and funding by the State of Arizona of the Rio Nuevo Tax Increment Finance District; and directing transmittal of this Resolution to State leaders. (District 1)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Cano to adopt the Resolution. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Scott stated that it was unfortunate that there had been members of the legislature who had referred to Rio Nuevo as an example of what they called crony capitalism, and that those in Pima County knew it had been a key to revitalization and investment downtown and throughout the Rio Nuevo area. He stated that if the majority Caucus budget was approved, then it may provide a short-term increase in state revenue but long term, it would cost the state money and cause a devastating decision for the people of Pima County. He acknowledged the members of the Rio Nuevo Board and noted that in the last meeting, Supervisor Chirsty had honored the memory of Chris Sheaf who passed away in a tragic car accident. He indicated that the community was grateful for the service of the Rio Nuevo Board and hoped the Governor and legislature would make the right decision about continuing Rio Nuevo when the final budget was passed.

Supervisor Christy expressed gratitude to Supervisor Scott for his comments which he endorsed wholeheartedly.

Supervisor Heinz expressed his support for the Resolution and was in legislature when it happened. He stated that instead of attacking or diminishing it they should look at expanding the area where businesses and investments could occur like farther down to 22nd Street.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

18. **Governor Raul H. Castro Memorial Highway**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 27, of the Board of Supervisors, supporting the designation of portions of Arizona's highway system as the "Governor Raul H. Castro Memorial Highway." (District 3)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Cano to adopt the Resolution. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Allen stated the if the Board voted to approve the Resolution their vote would be the first vote of support with similar efforts being made by the Nogales City Council, Sahuarita Town Council, and Santa Cruz Board of Supervisors. She stated that the stretch of highway from Nogales to Phoenix was symbolic of the impact work of Raul Castro and that his legacy was reflective of what they were naming.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

19. **Amended Board of Supervisors Meeting Schedule - August 2026**

Approval of the Board of Supervisors' Amended Meeting Schedule for the month of August, 2026, to add a Special Meeting on Monday, August 3, 2026, at 1:00 p.m., for the Canvass of the Primary Election. This special meeting will be held virtually.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

20. **Amended Board of Supervisors Meeting Schedule - November 2026**

Approval of the Board of Supervisors' Amended Meeting Schedule for the month of November, 2026, to add a Special Meeting on Thursday, November 19, 2026, at 1:00 p.m., for the Canvass of the General Election. This special meeting will be held virtually.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

21. The Board of Supervisors on April 21, 2026, continued the following:

Report from Sheriff Nanos Pursuant to A.R.S. §11-253(A)

Discussion/Direction/Action: Regarding receipt of a report requested by the Board of Supervisors from Sheriff Nanos in written and/or oral format regarding concerns related to Sheriff Nanos' work history, management of the Pima County Sheriff's

Department including, but not limited to, personnel and financial issues, and interaction with federal immigration officials.

Chair Allen stated that this item would be taken with Minute Item No. 36, Board Oversight and Potential Responses Concerning the Office of the Sheriff.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy that the Pima County Board of Supervisors declare the office of Pima County Sheriff as vacant and begin the process to replace the current sheriff immediately. The motion died for lack of a second.

It was then moved by Supervisor Scott, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-0 vote, Supervisor Christy abstained, that on the advice of legal counsel, the Board of Supervisors take no action to declare the office of Sheriff vacant, nor to move for the removal of the Sheriff based on A.R.S. §11-253, and that the Board refer allegations of potential perjury by the Sheriff to the Arizona Attorney General's Office and direct the County Administrator to do so on behalf of the Board, and that the Board takes no position on whether or not perjury was committed.

Supervisor Scott stated that since the Board was also considering the item related to Board Oversight and Potential Responses Concerning the Office of the Sheriff he felt that the motion the Board had just approved unanimously with one abstention spoke for itself but his chief concern with what has been going on within the Pima County Sheriff's Department (PCSD) was that their elected Sheriff had taken no discernible efforts to repair relationships and trust within their largest department. He stated that the most telling example of that was the unanimous vote of the Pima County Deputies' Organization, declaring no confidence in his leadership. He stated that there were over 60 members of that organization that abstained, but no one voted that they had confidence in the Sheriff's leadership, and well over 250 of the members of that organization voted no confidence. He stated that was very telling with regard to climate and feelings about the stewardship of the department by its front line employees. He stated that just as telling, were the emails and letters Board offices received from current and former PCSD employees that expressed no faith or trust in the Sheriff's leadership. He stated that they offered very specific examples of pettiness, favoritism and rash decision making. He stated that they also heard from several employees that expressed their support for the Sheriff, but there really was only one person in that department that could bring all those people together. He stated that it was the largest department in terms of number of employees that that leader needed to take, not just the first step, but the second step, and so on, to try and bring up the level of climate within that department. He stated that they first had to admit the obvious, that there was a real crisis of confidence within the department in his leadership. He stated that then he would have to reach out both publicly and privately, to both individuals and groups within the department, seeking their input and offering to engage in honest dialog. He stated that after those communicative efforts, they needed to bring forth a plan to rebuild rapport, relationships, and trust and ask to be held accountable for its success. He stated that based on the advice of legal counsel, he did not believe, and the majority of the Board agreed, that the Board had the right to remove the

Sheriff and declare the office vacant. He stated that the Sheriff met his obligations under the statute, but he felt that it was important that the Board make the referral to the Attorney General's Office, and what was most important, was that the Sheriff take immediate action to repair the extraordinary climate of distrust and lack of faith in his leadership.

Supervisor Cano acknowledged that for many people in the community, this discussion had been deeply personal and deeply concerning. He stated that he understood the genuine care that people had for the integrity of leadership within the PCSD and for the future of public safety throughout the County. He stated that he also understood how difficult it could be to see values reflected in a Sheriff they disagreed with. He stated that he was well aware because he had lived through it when S.B. 1070 was signed into law in 2010. He stated that he was a college student in Maricopa County during the height of Sheriff Joe Arpaio's power and he watched families and immigrants live in fear. He stated that most importantly, he watched neighbors lose faith in what public safety was supposed to mean and he learned during that time that the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, was not the ultimate decider of whether Sheriff Arpaio stayed in office or not, the people were, and the people acted through the democratic process by recalling Sheriff Arpaio. He stated that he used this example because it was relevant to the conversation the Board was having and that in Arizona, County Sheriffs were elected directly by the people every four years and were not hired by a Board of Supervisors, and they could not be removed by the Board in the way a City Manager could appoint or dismiss a City Police Chief. He stated that however, over the last month, this Board exercised a narrowly defined oversight tool and statute to ask questions of the Sheriff. He stated that responses were submitted and reviewed, and the Board’s legal counsel informed them regarding the limits of the Board's authority to proceed with any further action moving forward. He stated that the Board could only continue to listen to the concerns of residents, taxpayers and people across this County that wanted a safe place to live, wanted integrity and accountability from their public institutions. He stated that while much of this discussion centered on one individual, public safety in this County depended on far more than one person, 1,500 of the 7,000 County employees worked for the Sheriff's Department, they were the public servants answering calls, responding to emergencies, conducting investigations, and serving communities across the entire County. He stated that this was where the Board could and would continue to focus, ensuring that those public safety systems remained strong, stable and responsive to the people they served. He stated that the Board took the concerns raised before the entire community seriously and used the remedies within their legal authority to seek answers from an independently elected County Officer. He stated that the Board would continue meeting its responsibility to the people of Pima County by investing in those 1,500 men and women in the PCSD that kept this community safe every single day, which was their constitutional responsibility and their obligation to the public, and that was the work that this Board would continue focusing on moving forward.

Chair Allen thanked her colleagues for their thoughtful comments and stated that this had been a challenging conversation. She stated that the thing they held on to was the department, and that as Supervisor Cano had alluded to, it was the Sheriff's Department, the County's largest department, and they relied on the deputies every single day. She stated that she represented a rural district that was comprised of families that lived on bumpy dirt roads, seniors, immigrant families, other folks that called Pima County home. She stated that they relied on the PCSD for trust that when they needed to call the Sheriff they would be there and that justice would be served, that there would be responsiveness, and that there was accountability. She stated that those were essential values for essential services and for some folks that were isolated and vulnerable, and people that lived in fear. She thanked the department for stepping up and she imagined that this had been an incredibly difficult process and would still continue to be a difficult process. She stated that leadership was so incredibly important and leadership from the Sheriff was so incredibly important and she hoped that what they saw in the path ahead was true leadership that looked out for the interests of the full team, that looked out for the interests of all Pima County residents and reinstated the trust that was needed in the community and the Sheriff's Department.

22. **Elections 2026 Oversight Task Force**

Discussion/Action: Appointment of a member of the Board of Supervisors to serve on the Elections Oversight Task Force in accordance with the Memorandum to the Board of Supervisors of April 27, 2026 (attached), which delineates the establishment of an Elections Oversight Task Force.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that she had created a task force and this item was to appoint a member of the Board of Supervisors to that task force.

Supervisor Christy asked if there would be any discussion regarding the concept of the actual Board itself or the oversight committee.

Ms. Lesher stated that she would be happy to have follow-up conversations with Supervisor Christy regarding the intent of the task force.

Supervisor Christy asked if the Board would only be voting on a Board appointment to this task force.

Ms. Lesher responded in the affirmative.

It was moved by Supervisor Cano, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to appoint Supervisor Scott to serve on the Elections Oversight Task Force.

CONSERVATION LANDS AND RESOURCES

23. **Exception to the Multi-Species Conservation Plan Restricted Covenant**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 28, of the Board of Supervisors, to approve an exception to the Multi-Species Conservation Plan Restrictive Covenant to improve wildlife habitat on Tumamoc Hill.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to adopt the Resolution.

24. **Pima County Cooperative Extension (PCCE) Annual Appropriations**

Staff recommends approval of the appropriation of funds in the amount of $151,400.00, to allow PCCE services to be provided to the public.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

25. **Pima County Cooperative Extension (PCCE) - Wildfire Fuels Reduction in Pima County**

Staff recommends approval of the appropriation of funds in the amount of $125,000.00, to allow PCCE wildfire education services to be provided to the public.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

26. **Revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed revisions to Board of Supervisors Policy D 22.11, Public Safety Personnel Retirement System and Corrections Officer Retirement Plan Pension Funding.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

27. **Fiscal Year (FY) 2024/25 Audit Results**

Presentation of FY 2024/25 Audit Results by the Office of the Auditor General for compliance with Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) §11-661 and §41-1494. Staff recommends acceptance of the FY2024/25 audit results submitted by the Office of the Auditor General and approval of the Human Resources memorandum proposed in the separate agenda item demonstrating compliance with A.R.S. §41-1494.

(Clerk's Note: See the attached verbatim related to this item.)

It was moved by Supervisor Heinz, seconded by Chair Allen and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to accept the FY 2024/25 Audit results.

HUMAN RESOURCES

28. **Certification of Compliance with Arizona Revised Statutes**

Staff recommends approval of the memorandum certifying Pima County's compliance with A.R.S §11-661(D) and §41-1494.

It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Chair Allen indicated that this item was connected to the audit and she understood that it needed to be certified so that the County was in compliance, but she found the state statute appalling because it included the following language, *"this state, a state agency or a city, town, county or political subdivision of this state may not require an employee to engage in training, orientation or therapy that presents any forum of blame or judgement on the basis of race, ethnicity or sex,"* and *"may not use public monies for training, orientation, or therapy that presents any form of blame or judgment on the basis of race, ethnicity or sex."* She stated that the absurdity of the law was even more evident today in a state that faced a financial crisis and a federal government whose policies not only punished working people but wanted to make people of color, women and queer people literally and figuratively disappear.

Upon the vote, the motion carried 4-1, Chair Allen voted "Nay."

OFFICE OF DIGITAL INCLUSION

29. **Submission of Special Use Permit for National Park Service**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 29, of the Board of Supervisors, approving the submission of a special use permit for National Park Service Right of Way and acceptance of permit conditions.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to adopt the Resolution.

REAL PROPERTY

30. **Abandonment by Vacation**

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 - 30, of the Board of Supervisors, for the vacation of Sunfish Place and Sunbow Loop, planned development roadways, as Pima County road abandonment No. A-0073, within Section 13, T13S, R12E, G&SRM, Pima County, Arizona. (District 3)

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to adopt the Resolution.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Community and Workforce Development

31. COPE Community Services, Inc., to provide an Affordable Housing GAP Funding Agreement and Affordable Housing Restrictive Covenant for Shasta Apartments, term date 5/12/26 to 12/31/27, General Fund, contract amount $1,000,000.00 (PO2600009272)

    It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and carried by a 4-1 vote, Supervisor Christy voted “Nay,” to approve the item.

32. Interfaith Community Services, Amendment No. 1, to provide for Emergency Services Network (ESN) - Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), extend contract term to 6/30/26 and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount $303,034.19 (PO2500023401)

    It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

Procurement

33. Tenex Software Solutions, Inc., to provide for Tenex election desk module, Elections General (97%) and Recorder’s Office General (3%) Funds, contract amount $600,000.00 (SC2500000663) Administering Department: Information Technology, on behalf of Elections

    It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Cano and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

34. Swaim Associates, Ltd., to provide for architectural and engineering services: 130 W. Congress 10th and 11th floor tenant improvements, term date 5/12/26 to 6/30/29, General Fund - COPS, contract amount $499,985.37 (PO2600012841) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

    It was moved by Supervisor Christy and seconded by Supervisor Cano to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

    Supervisor Christy inquired about the completion date for these improvements.

Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that the project had taken time with the exterior renovation of the building and that the 10th and 11th floors had been intentionally left vacant until a discussion could be had about the potential relocation for the Board of Supervisors and County Administration back into the building.

Supervisor Christy asked when the Board had moved out of the building.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded in 2021.

Supervisor Christy asked if the intention had been to move back into the building in 2022.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., stated that there had been various intentions along the way.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, responded in 2028.

Supervisor Christy asked for any prognostication.

Mr. DeBonis, Jr., responded that with the award of the contract he expected roughly a two-year timeframe, a year for design and a year for construction.

Supervisor Heinz asked if the Board had to move back into the building.

Ms. Lesher stated that there had been opportunities to talk with members of the Board and their staff, and there had also been a brief discussion at the retreat. She stated that the space needed to be built out before it could be moved into and that ultimately that would be a decision of the Board.

Supervisor Heinz stated that monetarily it was not the best use of the old courthouse building to not have administration in and to rent it out to someone else, but that there should be a government entity in the building.

Ms. Lesher stated that when they finished the renovation of the historic courthouse and were looking to lease the space, there had been interest in the remaining 4,000 square feet, which was one of the reasons Administration moved at that time. She stated that they decided to move everyone out of the 10th and 11th floors so that they could get work done in the building. She stated that people had an opportunity to see the historic courthouse built out and saw what they could do with it. She stated that they looked at the entire plan to move department and organizations within the downtown area and continued to look at that building, and that the reality was they could rent space to another organization in the historic courthouse, but they could not do that in the tower which was some of the options they had discussed. She stated that before Supervisor Heinz was on the Board, both County Administration and the Board of Supervisors were in the building on adjacent floors, and there were positive feelings that came from the ability for that close interaction.

She stated that they had a year for planning and design which gave them the time to talk with the Board about what their desires were for the use of the building.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

35. **Waiving Pledge of Allegiance and Land Acknowledgement Statement on Study Session Agendas**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding waiving the Pledge of Allegiance and Land Acknowledgement Statement from the Study Session Agendas. Both will be provided during the Board of Supervisors' Regular Meetings.

It was moved by Supervisor Christy, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

36. **Board Oversight and Potential Responses Concerning the Office of the Sheriff**

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the potential actions by the Board related to the conduct of the Pima County Sheriff at issue in the Board's request for a report pursuant to A.R.S. §11-253(A), and including matters concerning statements, representations, and information provided to the Board in the report submitted, and verification later submitted, by the Sheriff pursuant to A.R.S. §11-253(A). (District 2)

(Clerk's Note: See Minute Item No. 21, for discussion and action related to this item.)

37. **Creation of Board of Supervisors Policy for Proclamations**

Discussion/Direction/Action: Creating a guiding policy for Board of Supervisors proclamations. Direct Administration to draft Board policy that allots each Supervisor office 24 proclamations per year (an average of one per meeting) that are presented at Board of Supervisors meetings and encourages Supervisor offices to present proclamations at events. (District 3)

It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

Supervisor Christy asked what would happen if a department asked a Supervisor to present a proclamation. He stated that stipulated in this particular item was that each Supervisor should be divvied up a certain quota per year and asked if a request from another department, administrator or the head of an administration department would go against his quota.

Chair Allen responded yes and that Supervisor Christy could frame it as going against or supporting the fulfillment of his quota. She stated that it was a glass half empty glass half full situation but that it was up for discussion.

Supervisor Christy stated that if it went towards his quota he could always disagree and say no. He asked what would happen if he had a quota of 24 proclamations per year, and he decided for the next meeting that he wanted all his proclamations proclaimed. He wondered if the Board should reflect on this more and continue it with a submission of recommendations or ideas to the Chair.

Chair Allen indicated that they could do that unless Supervisor Christy had an amendment.

Supervisor Christy responded that at this time he did not and he did not know how to control it. He stated that he loved proclamations and felt they were important, but they were getting out of hand.

Supervisor Heinz asked if they could quantify the number of proclamations that were coming specifically from departments and then use that information to inform the Board's decision.

Jan Lesher, County Administrator, stated that they could check which proclamations went through departments, like Corrections Officers Day or Health Days, and get that count for the Board to get an idea of where they were coming from or how that occurred. She asked for clarification if this was limiting the number of proclamations that would be presented at a Board meeting, but that any member of the Board could provide additional proclamations that would be approved at a Board meeting and then presented at an event or at another activity.

Chair Allen responded yes and that this did not limit the number of proclamations that could be put on the consent calendar for approval and then delivered at community events. She clarified that this only related to the proclamations that would be presented at the Board meeting and acknowledged that these were important.

Supervisor Christy asked if a Supervisor did not want to use the 24 proclamations that would be allocated to them if there would be trading amongst district offices. He stated that he was as guilty as anyone requesting them, but provided an example of the Department of Health asking his office to present a proclamation honoring something like Men's Health Week and he would not want to turn that down because he wanted every man to be healthy, but he did not initiate it.

Chair Allen stated that the Clerk had noted that this item was explicitly directing the County Administrator to create a policy, so per their own definition the item would be brought back for the Board's consideration.

Supervisor Christy stated he would like the proposed policy brought back as soon as possible.

Supervisor Scott asked if it would be deferred until January.

Supervisor Cano stated that they had belabored the point and that a draft policy was forthcoming, but he was not interested in the Board having staff that policed proclamations. He felt like the most important thing they should do was distinguish what should be on a public facing agenda with the presentation to the public, versus what could be on consent for a presentation in private, or at a later time, and it was going to require an adjustment. He stated that he had never seen a cap like this, but that the Board should absolutely recognize that the flexibility and this policy was based on the five Supervisors coming together around consensus and how that happened and which meetings it happened at. He stated that was the reason they had an agenda committee and why the Board tasked the Administrator and the Clerk with this. He stated that these were good questions for what he hoped would be reformed so that the Board would not be at meetings until 10:00 p.m.

Supervisor Christy asked if the Board would expect a recommendation from the County Administrator.

Chair Allen responded in the affirmative.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

CONTRACT AND AWARD

PROCUREMENT

38. Sundt Construction, Inc., to provide for Country Club Road - Michigan Street to Milber Street Roadway Improvements Project, term date 5/12/26 to 6/30/27, City Revenue Other Operation (48%), Central Region Impact Fees (44%), and Transfer in from Capital Projects (8%) Funds, contract amount $3,083,135.14 (PO2600013675) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

39. **Election Integrity Commission**

Reappointment of Connie Delarge. Term expiration: 5/2/28. (District 2)

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

40. **Board of Adjustment, District 3**

Appointment of Doug Schneider, to fill a vacancy created by Rene Rodriguez. Term expiration: 5/11/30.

It was moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the item.

CONSENT CALENDAR

41. **Approval of the Consent Calendar**

At the request of Supervisor Heinz to divide the question, Consent Calendar Item No. 5 was set aside for separate discussion and vote.

Supervisor Christy acknowledged the Green Valley Gardeners who had worked hard at formulating Consent Calendar Item No. 11. He stated that they had been working to provide a Pima County license for right-of-way encroachment to access County right-of-way medians for planting, watering, and maintaining vegetation and related irrigation equipment. He stated that there was no cost except for their hard work and labor. He stated they were proud members of the Green Valley community and he was grateful for all of their work.

It was then moved by Chair Allen, seconded by Supervisor Heinz and unanimously carried by a 5-0 vote, to approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

* * *

<u>PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION BY SUPERVISOR HEINZ</u>

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Procurement

5. Sundt Construction, Inc., to provide for Construction Manager at Risk Services: Downtown Library relocation, Capital Projects Fund (Library District Funds), contract amount $362,295.00/5 year term (PO2600012251) Administering Department: Project Design and Construction

   It was moved by Chair Allen and seconded by Supervisor Heinz to approve the item. No vote was taken at this time.

   Supervisor Heinz requested additional details about the project and inquired about the term of the project.

   Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator, stated that the five-year term was standard, and it was not anticipated to take five years, but the design process and construction process would take several years. He stated that staff would begin outreach and community engagement for the project and that would give staff the opportunity to hear what the needs of the community were for the design and configuration of the library.

Upon the vote, the motion unanimously carried 5-0.

* * *

CONTRACT AND AWARD

Attractions and Tourism

1. Metropolitan Tucson Convention & Visitors Bureau, Amendment No. 1, to promote and enhance tourism, business travel, film production and youth, amateur, semi-professional and professional sports development and marketing, and amend contractual language, General Fund, contract amount $500,000.00 (PO2500015062)

Facilities Management

2. EliTechGroup, Inc., Amendment No. 1, to provide for assumption of AST Revolution, L.L.C., by EliTechGroup, Inc., to memorialize their merger and assume all obligations under the lease agreement for space at the Abrams Building, and amend contractual language, no cost (CT2500000058)

Procurement

3. **Award**
Award: Supplier Contract No. SC2600000064, FX Tactical, L.L.C., to provide for Sheriff's Department uniforms and accessories. This supplier contract is for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amount of $320,000.00 (including sales tax) and includes four (4) one-year renewal options. <u>Funding Source</u>: Sheriff's Department Special Revenue Fund. <u>Administering Department</u>: Sheriff's Department.

4. **Award**
Award: Multiple Supplier Contracts, to provide for body armor and outer carriers. These supplier contracts are for an initial term of one (1) year in the annual award amounts shown in the table below and include four (4) one-year renewal options. <u>Funding Source</u>: OSR Sheriff Smart & Safe Prop 207 (60%) and General (40%) Funds. <u>Administering Department</u>: Sheriff's Department.

<u>Group No./Supplier Name (Headquarters)/Supplier Contract No./Contract Award Amount</u>
Group A/Diamondback Police Supply, Co. (Tucson, AZ)/SC2600000069/$443,000.00 including sales tax

Group B/TYR Tactical, L.L.C. (Peoria, AZ)/SC2600000068/$421,000.00 including sales tax

5. Sundt Construction, Inc. (PULLED FOR SEPARATE ACTION)

Public Defense Services

6. University of Arizona, to provide for the University of Arizona Federal Work Study Program Off-Campus Agreement, term date 5/12/26 to 6/30/27, contract amount $100,000.00 revenue (CT2500000088)

Real Property

7. Green Things, Inc., to provide a Pima County License for Right-of-Way Encroachment (LIC - 0387) of an existing fence within the County right-of-way along E. Allen Road, total contract amount $8,926.25 ($357.05 per year) revenue/25 year term (CT2600000044)

8. Daniel B. Lee, Amendment No. 1, to provide an Airport Hangar License Agreement for use of Hangar Space No. 4 at the Eric Marcus Airport, extend contract term to 5/2/31 and amend contractual language, contract amount $8,400.00 revenue (CTN_21-119)

9. Ajo Domestic Water Improvement District and Pima County, to provide a Non-Exclusive Right-of-Way Use License for Public Utility Facilities, no cost/25 year term (SC2600000077)

10. United States of America, Department of Energy, Western Area Power Administration, to provide an Agreement for Exchange of Real Property for Tucson-Del Bac Project upgrades on Tumamoc Hill property, no cost/10 year term (SC2600000075)

11. Green Valley Gardeners, to provide a Pima County License for Right-of-Way Encroachment (LIC - 0389) to access County right-of-way medians to plant, water, and maintain vegetation and related irrigation equipment, no cost/5 year term (SC2600000076)

12. River Overlook, L.L.C., to provide for Sales Agreement No. Sale-0158 and Special Warranty Deed for 2,483 sq. ft. of land located at 1450 W. River Terrace Drive, a portion of Tax Parcel No. 104-01-040L, contract amount $10,435.00 revenue (CT2600000043)

GRANT APPLICATION/ACCEPTANCE

13. **Acceptance - Community and Workforce Development**
Arizona Community Action Association, d.b.a. Wildfire, Amendment No. 2, to provide for the 2025-26 Utility Assistance Programs, to decrease Global

Water Bill Assistance allocation from $50,000.00 to $40,000.00, no cost (GA-CWD-82495GT)

14. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, to provide for the Voluntary Lawn and Garden Equipment Emissions Reduction Program, $50,000.00 (G-DE-103903GT)

15. **Acceptance - Environmental Quality**
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, to provide for the Voluntary No-Drive Days Program, $257,272.00 (G-DE-103902GT)

BOARD, COMMISSION AND/OR COMMITTEE

16. **Self-Insurance Trust Fund Board**
Appointment of Nancy Davis, to fill a vacancy created by Hector Encinas. Term expiration: 12/31/28. (Staff recommendation)

17. **Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee**
Appointment of Claire L. Zucker, Citizens Water Advisory Committee, to fill a vacancy created by Alan Forrest. Term expiration: 3/1/30. (Organizational recommendation)

18. **Air Quality Hearing Board**
Reappointments of Paloma Beamer, Ph.D., Dr. Philip Harber, M.D., M.P.H. and Dustin Fitzpatrick. Term expirations: 7/4/28. (Staff recommendations)

19. **Environmental Quality Advisory Council**
   - Reappointment of Leslie T. Katz, representing Water Resources. Term expiration: 10/17/28. (Staff recommendation)
   - Appointment of Bradley Akers, representing Automotive Business/Industry, to fill a vacancy created by Robert Hobbs. Term expiration: 5/11/29. (Staff recommendation)

20. **Pima County Healthcare Benefits Trust Board**
Correction to term expiration: Oscar Diaz, term expiration: ~~8/6/29~~ **3/15/27**.

SPECIAL EVENT LIQUOR LICENSE/TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PREMISES/ PATIO PERMIT/WINE FAIR/WINE FESTIVAL/JOINT PREMISES PERMIT APPROVED PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION NO. 2019-68

21. **Special Event**
   - John Walter Kenning, Jr., Santa Catalina Catholic Church, 14380 N. Oracle Road, Tucson, May 24, 2026.
   - Tamara Marie Middleton, Saint Rita in the Desert Catholic Church, 13260 E. Colossal Cave Road, Vail, May 16 and 17, 2026.

- Dolores Guadalupe Alday, Our Lady of Fatima Parish, 1950 W. Irvington Place, Tucson, May 30 and 31, 2026.
- Lance P. Laber, DeGrazia Foundation, DeGrazia Gallery in the Sun, 6300 N. Swan Road, Tucson, May 15, 16 and 17, 2026.

ELECTIONS

22. **Cancellation of Uncontested Precinct Committeemen Races**
Staff recommends the cancellation of uncontested Precinct Committeemen races for the July 21, 2026, Primary Election and the appointment of those who have filed nomination petitions or write-in nomination papers.

23. **Precinct Committeemen**
Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-821B, approval of Precinct Committeemen resignations and appointments:

RESIGNATION-PRECINCT-PARTY:
Robert Young-016-DEM, Shanna Leonard-016-DEM, Jeffrey Cinnamond-112-DEM, William Burns-247-DEM, Raoul Garza-036-REP, William Lake-Wright-069-REP, Daniel Fuentes-075-REP, Cathy Blake-120-REP, Martha Alvarado-146-REP, Arlene Westphal-174-REP, Isabella Sizer-227-REP, Lori Erwin-232-REP, Mark Erwin-232-REP, Carol Archbold-239-REP, Anastasia Tsatsakis-249-REP, Patricia Hanson-262-REP

APPOINTMENT-PRECINCT-PARTY:
Eva Da Silva-012-DEM, Brandon Quihuis-013-DEM, Michael Harkness-034-DEM, Alex Randall-045-DEM, Shanna Leonard-058-DEM, Tony Vacura-058-DEM, Suzanne Maisner-096-DEM, William Burns-111-DEM, John Batchelor-112-DEM, Miguel Olivas-120-DEM, Vincent Pawlowski-161-DEM, Douglas Weiner-164-DEM, Jonathan Hecht-164-DEM, Seth Weide-164-DEM, Robert Young-202-DEM, Trisha Smith-224-DEM, Colton Gates-227-DEM, Robert Contreras-006-REP, Elizabeth Kazmierczak-006-REP, John Winchester-079-REP, Ron DeSouza-109-REP, Sandra Duarte-123-REP, Brett Watins-177-REP, Sharon Greene-209-REP, Michael Meoak-225-REP

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

24. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**
HealthMark Group $58.45; Smith's Detection, Inc. $19,188.81; Larsen Baker, L.L.C. $3,880.68; SWVP Starr Pass, L.L.C. $93,648.97; SWVP Starr Pass, L.L.C. $69,360.33; Southern Arizona Television $107.23; Trico Electric Cooperative, Inc. $2,825.90; The University of Arizona Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory $10,992.50; High Point Networks, L.L.C. $363.23; Arcadia Park Apartments $4,000.00; Flowing Wells Neighborhood Association $1,788.40; Horizon Distributors, Inc. $508.85; DMT Clear Gas Solutions, L.L.C. $8,178.69; DMT Clear Gas Solutions, L.L.C. $3,550.51; Unifirst Corporation

$4,418.30; Mission Vista Apartments $3,395.00; Ferguson Enterprises, L.L.C. $20,374.94; Riverwalk Luxury Apartments $4,695.00; NAEGELI Deposition and Trial $1,756.36; Teresa Meyer-Clemens $220.00; SSBN LTD t/a Fathom $20,000.00; Rio Salado Behavioral Health Systems, Inc. $1,888.00; Rio Salado Behavioral Health Systems, Inc. $3,296.00; Rio Salado Behavioral Health Systems, Inc. $1,442.00; Rio Salado Behavioral Health Systems, Inc. $1,159.00; Colores Del Sol Apartments $2,230.00; Lakeside Casitas, L.L.C. $4,000.00; David A Dunn III $9.15; Emily Strandberg $425.00; TYPSA, Inc. $12,733.04; Aeon Nexus Corporation $130,200.00; Senergy Petroleum, L.L.C. $2,457.80.

TREASURER

25. **Duplicate Warrants - For Ratification**
TS PORTFOLIO SERVICES, L.L.C. $786.78

RATIFY AND/OR APPROVE

26. Minutes: February 17, 2026 and March 3, 2026 (Joint Meeting)
Warrants: April, 2026

* * *

42. **ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

____
CHAIR

ATTEST:

____
CLERK

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

15. The Board of Supervisors on April 21, 2026, continued the following:

2026 Regional Transportation Authority Special Election

Discussion/Direction/Action regarding the After-Action Reports prepared and presented by Pima County's Recorder and Elections Director, and/or designee, to include, but not limited to, addressing the new voting system implemented, as well as the deployment of the "Votemobile" during the special election period. (District 4)

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
SC: Supervisor Christy
CH: Constance Hargrove, Director, Elections Department
GCK: Gabriella Cázares-Kelly, Pima County Recorder

JA: We have a time certain at 6:45. I am wondering if those who are here for that 6:45, would be game for doing it a little bit early? Okay, I see two head shakes. So, let us then go over to item number 19 on the regular agenda. This is unfinished business from a previous meeting, 2026 Regional Transportation Authority Special Election. This is an item from District 4, so I will pass it to Supervisor Christy.

SC: Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Recorder and Madam Elections Director, thank you so much for coming here tonight to go over the after-action report. We did not have a chance to do it in the last couple of meetings, and we appreciate your willingness to be here tonight to answer some questions regarding that report. First, Madam Elections Director, Ms. Hargrove, thank you for your very comprehensive and detailed report. It covered a whole wide range of areas and issues very comprehensively. It was a easy read, and I appreciate and I know the community appreciates your conscientious efforts to provide a very clear and dedicated synopsis of the voting situation in a highly irregular election, the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) election. Really, I only have one question for you, and that is, what do you foresee, or predict or envision, as any kind of new approach for the upcoming primary election, and any elections after that?

CH: Chair Allen, members of the Board, good afternoon, thank you for allowing me to be here to actually speak to that. So, for future elections, of course, we now have our Citizens portal, where individuals who present propositions to the County, that the County is responsible for, can now have citizens provide their arguments for and against anything that they put forward. That is definitely a step forward. We are actually required to have that, but that is a step forward, as well as our new election night reporting, got to highlight that. Our new election night reporting, where you can actually see the results of the County's election right there immediately without having to go to the State's website to see it. Of course, with statewide elections, you still have to go to that site. One of the major things that we have implemented so far is the ballot proofing, which I will have more information, of course, after we get through this election but so far, with the new ballot proofing and having the additional individuals come in to take a look at what we are doing. Of course, anytime when you look at something all the time, it all begins to look the same and as far as you know, it is correct, right? So, your brain begins to kind of transform things into what it should be when maybe it should not. So, very small minute, maybe formatting, maybe quotation marks, one may be one way, one may be in a different direction, bolding different things like that were caught very quickly with these proofers. So, I was really excited about that and then just other things that we would, in the first stage of the proofing process that we actually caught before it actually got to the third tier, which would still be in my office to prove. So, we were really excited about that. The timeline worked out well, and we were able to get those proofs out to the candidates this week for them to review so that we can timely submit those to the vendor. Moving forward, the Recorder's Office and the Elections Department, we work very closely together. We communicate often before the election, during the election, and after the election. And so, I think what we are looking forward to going forward, is a better coordination of Election Day when we do have vote centers open when there are sites open for early voting, emergency voting on Monday. When we do our Monday night setup, a better coordination of how we transition from one part of the election to the other part before Election Day. We are in the process of meeting with libraries to ensure that everyone has a understanding of the two different functions, the two different offices, what the different requirements are, that the Recorder's Office is actually a separate entity who needs the space for 27 days. Whereas the Elections office only needs that space for basically two days. So, we reserve it for the Monday to go in and set up, and then we reserve it for Tuesday. So, lots of things to look forward to. One of the things that you can look forward to is the new law that is in place. I am going to make this very brief, where individuals can drop off their early ballots at a vote center, have it ID verified. So, we would verify the individual's identification. We would stamp that early ballot, it goes in a separate box for us, whereas that ballot now does not have to go through signature verification because we have already verified it at the vote center. And so one of the exciting things about Pima County, is that we are already implementing where we can check these voters into our e-poll books and we can verify at the end of the night how many we checked in against our count of ballots, physical ballots that we have. We can produce a report for the Recorder's Office where they can upload that information and give the voters a record of vote without actually having to touch these ballots a second time. So, we are really excited about that. So that is a new process that will be in place on Election Day and more information to come. So, we will have some communications going out about that so voters will know what to expect on Election Day.

SC: I failed to mention also, thanks for your accessibility, and if there has ever been an issue with any of my constituents or anybody in particular with the voting process, you and your staff have always been accessible, always been available, and it is highly and greatly appreciated for that kind of forthcoming, so thank you. And I think my final question to you, Ms. Hargrove, do you have any idea what the final question I might be asking you right now might be?

CH: What is keeping me up at night?

SC: That is the one.

CH: Honestly, lots of things but thank you for that question.

SC: Nothing specific you would want to share?

CH: No, sir. Not at the moment.

SC: Well, thank you again very much for your report and for your thoroughness and preparation. Madam Recorder, I have a number of questions. One of them we discussed the last time you were here on this issue, and that has to do with the Vote Mobile. In your final report, you mentioned that this project was made possible by a grant from the Tohono O'odham Nation in partnership with the Pima County Board of Supervisors. This was a grant given to the Elections Department by the nation. It was not revealed how much the grant was for, or the purpose of what the grant was for, to the Board of Supervisors. We had no knowledge, no understanding, no idea about this Votemobile until it was presented to us. And I think it is not accurate to say that we were in any kind of a partnership when the Board of Supervisors never received any information on it, nor did we approve it or not. But you were able to get it approved through the process, but it was not divulged or brought before the Board of Supervisors.

JA: If I may, that actually is not true. We did go back in and look at the records, and we did find that the Board of Supervisors did receive the grant and approved the grant.

SC: But we were not advised of what the grant was for, nor were we advised as to how much.

JA: We saw the grant language.

SC: And that was after it was accepted.

JA: What I saw was that the Board had saw and approved the contract.

SC: Well, that was not my understanding, but be that as it may, my understanding from our discussion the last time was that there was no prior knowledge of what the grant was for, what it was going to be used for. But let us move on to the actual Votemobile statistics in your report. You do indicate the places of the location that the Votemobile went, and the amount of ballots that were dropped off, and the replacement ballots that were issued on site. So, if you add up all of the locations, roughly one, two, three, four, five, and at those five locations, 1,948 ballots were dropped off, and only 42 ballots were issued on site. So, 42 people actually voted while there were just under 2,000 that were dropped off. So really, this is more of a dropping off center, rather than a vote center.

GCK: Chair Allen, supervisors. First, I would like to respond to the confusion about the grant. The grant was unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors on September 6, 2022, and a second supplementary grant was unanimously approved on August 8, 2023, for the purchase of the mobile voting unit. It was very clear within those documents that that was the intention. We went through all appropriate legal processes, through Procurement, through legal. We did everything according to the requirements of Pima County to procure that vehicle, and it was very much communicated that we were going to have this mobile voting unit. So, that is one, the next thing is, yes, our mobile voting unit is both used for ballot drop off, as well as, issuing ballots on site. Many of our locations throughout Pima County have a higher number of ballot drop offs than they do actual ballots being issued. It is both a part of the benefit of having early voting sites in all of those locations and a Votemobile is simply a self-contained early voting site.

SC: Well, I think we are not going to be able to agree on how it was procured because this was an agreement that was a pass-through item. No grants were listed, and we went through each BOSAIR agenda item. No mention that this was ‘X’ amount of money for the vote mobile, that is our finding. I guess we will have to agree to disagree on that. Moving on to observers. We have a number of observers at one, two, three, four, five locations, including the Votemobile. The Recorders Country Club Office processing center, the main office, the Ward 2 Office. Number of observers are listed at each one, respectively 2, 1, 3, 3, 2. Are these, for instance, Recorders Country Club Office ballot processing center number of observers two. Is that per day, for the whole month? Since the voting is open for a month. What is the breakdown on that? And on the Votemobile, it only was available at a much more limited time frame and it shows two observers. Is that also two per day or per week? Or what are the numbers of observers represent as far as participation.

GCK: Chair Allen, Board of Supervisors, that number indicates the number of observers that we had during the duration of that election.

SC: Duration. What do you mean duration? The whole time there were two each day, or…?

GCK: There would have been, and I would have to pull up their logs, but there were several observers who came, I believe, multiple days in a row. They…

SC: Were there two observers there every day during that process?

GCK: No.

SC: How many were there during the process?

GCK: We do not, other than the information that is listed here, we are not breaking down that information because it is not required for us to have observers in order to complete our functions.

SC: So there very well could have been no observers?

GCK: Yes. Observers are not required for us to complete any of our statutory functions whatsoever. It is simply for their personal enjoyment.

SC: Under your title of challenges and resolutions under available voting options. Are you open to placing ballot drop boxes, perhaps in Pima County libraries during their hours of operation?

GCK: Chair Allen, Board of Supervisors, I am currently in communication with Pima County Libraries about the placement of additional ballot drop boxes. We are talking about installing them so that they are available 24/7 during the early voting time frame.

SC: Are libraries under consideration?

GCK: Yes.

SC: Throughout Pima County?

GCK: Not throughout Pima County, because we have a large number of libraries here. And each ballot drop box is very expensive. It is a $6,000.00 box for just the box. That does not include freight, taxes, placement, the waterless fire extinguisher, cameras, nor the couriers to empty them. So, it is a very expensive option for us to have. However, in locations where there is a high volume, or maybe in areas where it is low volume, in rural locations. We are looking at installing boxes in those additional locations. So, currently we are in conversation with Ajo, Sells, Sahuarita, Oro Valley. We are trying to get the University of Arizona. It is not looking like it is going to happen this cycle. We may be bringing forth additional amendments to our drop-off options. We are hoping, if we can move this through as quickly as possible, that we could have those in place before the primary, but certainly before the general election.

SC: Could they be placed inside the libraries that way they would even be more secure and easier to access and operate during hours?

JA: I am sorry, if I may, Supervisor Christy, these are very specific questions. I am wondering if perhaps you could submit these in writing to the Recorder and get answers to some of those specific questions, because I am not really sure where we are going.

SC: I have only got a couple three more to go, and it will not take me long, Madam Chair and if it gets to be that we cannot get an answer, we will be glad to do that. But just a couple of more questions. One of the issues was a website reporting versus canvass report, and that the Elections Department caught a discrepancy in the number of eligible voters, and the Elections Department corrected the total that was in the discrepancy. How are you prepared to address those complaints?

GCK: Chair Allen, Board of Supervisors. I guess I would like to understand your further question. That issue has been resolved. I do not understand your question.

SC: Well, I am just going by what you say in your report. Does it say it is resolved? It says that there was some discrepancy in the number of eligible voters, as well as, also in the single ballot affidavit return envelopes. And you say we are prepared to continue to address these complaints.

GCK: I see, my apologies for that. The original number of eligible voters that we submitted to the Elections Department included a number of federal only national active voters who are not eligible for jurisdictional elections. It did not make any changes to any of the… no ballots were issued to those folks. If they had come, it would have shown up as national active or federal only. And so, we realized that we had sent the quarterly report. We are required to send those to the Secretary of State's Office and because this is such a rare County-wide election, my staff inadvertently sent the quarterly numbers, which normally would have sufficed. Again, this is specific to a jurisdictional, and so those numbers would have been correct for a federal election, and so we simply sent the wrong information. We completely own up to that. We had a conversation with the Elections Department, and it was through our standard audits that we have multi-day audits after an election to ensure that all of our numbers match up to what they are supposed to. And if there is any reason that it does not, it is a red flag for us to, to take a look at the data and that is exactly what happened. And so, yes, this has been resolved. It was resolved in time for the canvass. It was completely appropriate. It was completely resolved. It was simply a matter of those federal only voters being reported. And that was again, it made absolutely no impact to the voters. No voters were impacted whatsoever. And we were able to resolve that. The other situation that we had was, a difference in reporting for the paper receipts for ballot turnovers. And so, a paper receipt is issued when we wheel over the signature verified ballots over to the Elections Department. We have a physical piece of paper that my staff sign and her staff signs, and they are then uploaded into our online website for public viewing. It is very specific that those reports are available, and they are viewable to the public for transparency purposes, but they are not official results of anything. That is simply to show the number of, there is a high interest in turnout, and that is what we use them for. Those individual receipts are individually scanned and uploaded, and sometimes they are uploaded within batches at a time, and every once in a while, there might not be one. And through our audits, again, standard automatic thing that we do after every election, we make sure that we have all receipts, all T's crossed, all the I's dotted, and we were able to scan that last receipt and that was never an issue. It was resolved throughout the audit process. We did get a legal challenge. But I will say I cannot say too much about that legal challenge, but it was in connection with the proposition of the sale of software or something of that sort.

SC: Well, thank you for that. And my final question, Madam Chair. I would just like to point out that in your locations for the ballot drop offs and future initiatives, we do not see any action in that regard in Vail, Green Valley, the Tanque Verde Valley, or really on the southeast side. And I am hoping that is going to be taken into consideration.

GCK: We will have an early voting location in Sahuarita. That is not a Votemobile. We are going to be there for multiple days within that region and so that has been a conversation that I think there is a overall struggle…

SC: Anything we can do in our district office to assist in your finessing that ability to get locations, of course we are available, but I appreciate the fact that you are looking into that and trying to be as accommodating as possible. It means a lot to the folks out there, as you can imagine. With that, thank you, Madam Chair and thank you, Madam Recorder. Did you want to say something else?

CH: Yes. Can I just, Madam Chair, speak to the observers? So, throughout the course of the election, the parties will provide observers. They will send observers to observe whatever processes we may be doing at the time. We have our early ballot processing and we have our tabulation processing throughout the election, and then of course, Election Day. There is not always an observer assigned to the early ballot processing. It really depends on the staffing of the parties and who they can find to do it. So, for me, if I were speaking, if you asked me the same question, I do not keep track of how many observers are there per day. We do know who is there. Normally there is someone in the tabulation room. There is always someone in the tabulation room, and we try to ensure that they do have enough people to do that. But on a daily basis, we may not see someone in every area where we are processing ballots. So just wanted to clarify that.

JA: I will just say thank you both for being here. Thank you for your transparency. Both reports, I think, were a reflection of having strong internal controls and demonstrating that internal controls work. That is why you have them. You have reported them and I appreciate your sort of prompt response as items are identified things to fix and improve. And so, I really appreciate the work and the accountability that I think is exemplified from both of your offices and knowing that it has been a whirlwind of nonstop elections. So given all of that, much appreciation for all that you and your teams do. Thank you.

FINANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

27. **Fiscal Year (FY) 2024/25 Audit Results**

Presentation of FY 2024/25 Audit Results by the Office of the Auditor General for compliance with Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) §11-661 and §41-1494. Staff recommends acceptance of the FY2024/25 audit results submitted by the Office of the Auditor General and approval of the Human Resources memorandum proposed in the separate agenda item demonstrating compliance with A.R.S. §41-1494.

Verbatim

JA: Chair Allen
RS: Supervisor Scott
MH: Supervisor Heinz
SC: Supervisor Christy
AC: Supervisor Cano
LP: Lindsey A. Perry, Auditor General, Arizona Auditor General's Office
KED: Katherine Edwards Decker, Financial Audit Director, Arizona Auditor General's Office
VF: Vicki Fisher, Financial Audit Manager, Arizona Auditor General's Office

---

JA: We are now going to have to, because it is 6:00, we have to put a pause on Call to the Public. Switch over to our time certain presentation by the Auditor General and then we would be resuming Call to the Audience, thereafter. I will flag that we have another time certain at 6:45. So, moving on to Item No. 31 on the agenda. This is the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024/25 Audit Results. We will first hear the presentation, and then the Board will consider the item.

LP: Madam Chair, members, Administrator Lesher, good evening. Thank you for having us. I am Lindsey Perry, the Auditor General for the State. Joining me today is also Katherine Edwards Decker, she is my Financial Audit Director and Vicki Fisher, she oversaw the County's audits. She is a Manager in my Financial Audit Division. So again, thank you for inviting us to attend your regular Board meeting to present the audit results and findings for Pima County. Today Katherine is going to cover some of the financial highlights from the County, briefly. I know you received all of this from us several months ago and then Vicki will discuss our audit results. But before we get to that, if we could go to the next slide, please. One more. I know many of you are aware of my office, but I wanted to refresh your memory. My office is a legislative agency made up of nonpartisan staff. We provide impartial information and specific recommendations to improve the operations and programs of state and local entities, including the County. We are well versed in and follow several standards, including governmental auditing standards. Next slide please. Similar to our previous presentations in front of the Board, we are here today in accordance with state law, which directs the County Board of Supervisors to require its auditors, my office, to present audit results and findings to the Board in a regular meeting without the use of a consent agenda, and within 90 days of the report's completion. This is a great opportunity for us to be in front of you, to answer your questions, to help you understand what we are finding, and what strides the County is making from the prior fiscal year. So, we are here to answer questions as well as provide information. Next slide please. Each year, the County signs what we call engagement terms and conditions, and this document outlines our responsibilities, as well as your responsibilities, regarding the financial statement and single audit reports. Highlighted for you on this slide, are some of our key responsibilities, including conducting audits in accordance with various auditing standards and federal requirements. We obtain reasonable assurance about whether the County's financial statements are free from material misstatement. While reasonable assurance is high, it is not absolute. It is not an absolute level of assurance. With that being said, the risk of not identifying material misstatements and noncompliance is higher due to fraud than from any other error, because fraud, as you know, oftentimes involves collaborative efforts and includes management not using or overriding internal controls. Further, we operate under a no surprises approach, and we are responsible for keeping you informed and your management team of things that we are finding on the audit, significant matters, both on the financial statement and federal single audit sides. We also report our opinion to you, as auditors, on your financial statements and federal awards. On a side note, you may recall last year my office was granted authority to conduct procedural reviews of County Treasurer's offices. Our presentation today will not cover it, that is a separate review. However, my team is currently conducting the procedural review of Pima County Treasurer's Office, and we certainly will report to you separately when we have concluded that work. Next slide please. On this slide. I am sorry, I might be one behind. Next slide please. There we go. On this slide are some of the key County responsibilities for the audit process, including providing accurate financial statements and financial information in accordance with accounting principles and federal requirements. Additionally, providing fraud representations, including formal communication from the County about your responsibilities for preventing fraud that you have communicated with my team about all known and suspected fraud, and that you have not hidden or failed to provide any material information to my team. We sent the fraud representation letter to the Board in July of 2025 for the audit results we are discussing today. Additionally, the County is responsible for taking corrective action on any audit findings, which includes providing a written corrective action plan that is included in your audit reports and we will briefly discuss that later in our presentation. Finally, the County is responsible for providing my team with unrestricted access to staff, documentation, information systems and any resources necessary to complete the audit. This also includes meeting deadlines that were previously agreed upon at the start of the audit. Next slide please. If we could go back two, that one. Today we will be discussing our audit work on three required annual reports. So, the first is the County's annual comprehensive financial report. Second is the report on internal control and on compliance and finally, the federal Single Audit report. As we have done in the past, when your annual reports were completed, we emailed each of you links to these reports, which we issued in February and March of this year, respectively. The first report, the County's annual Comprehensive Financial Report, presents the County's annual financial statements and our opinion on them. For FY2025, I am happy to report really good news that we reported an unmodified, which is an auditor's term for clean opinion, which means the County's financial statements are reliable. The second report, a report on internal control and compliance, which is included in the Single Audit report, is where we report any findings and recommendations resulting from our audit of the County's financial statements. We reported two federal financial statement findings, and Vicki will cover those later in our presentation. Finally, the third and final report, the Federal Single Audit Report includes our assessment of the County's compliance with federal program requirements over each federal program that we are required to audit and express an opinion on. This report allows the federal government to understand if the County is spending federal monies in compliance with the requirements. So, for FY2025, we reported qualified opinions due to noncompliance regarding reporting compliance requirements on two of five major federal programs or clusters that we tested. This also resulted in two single audit findings. Again, Vicki will cover those, shortly. Before we get into those findings, Katherine is briefly going to go through the County's five-year financial trends and highlights. Next slide please. Thank you.

KED: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the Board and County Administrator Lesher. My name is Katherine Edwards Decker. Because we know these reports can be lengthy and complex, we also prepare audit report highlights, which is a three-page summary that you received with the Single Audit Report. I would like to take the opportunity to present some key financial information for the County over the last five years, which are included in the highlights. The graph that is on the screen here highlights the five-year trend of the County's revenues, expenses and net total net position. Total County revenues are shown in light blue, and total County expenses are shown in dark blue. It is important to note that the County's revenues have exceeded its expenses since at least fiscal year 2021. The County's four main sources of revenue continue to be County property tax, federal and state grant programs, shared-state sales tax and County sales taxes. The County's property taxes increased in 2025 by nearly $39.8 million, due to an increased Net Assessed Valuation of taxable property in the County, while federal and state grant programs decreased by $51.3 million due to expiration or termination of COVID-19 funding. Overall, the total of all County revenues decreased by $64.6 million in FY25. The County's four primary expense purposes continue to consist of general government, public safety, health and welfare, and highways and streets. Public safety and highways and streets have remained relatively consistent since the prior fiscal period, while general government expenses have increased by $55.4 million, mostly attributed to the recognition of the County's new Enterprise Resource Planning (ER) system and salary increases. Health and welfare expenses have fluctuated up and down a little over the last five years, however, decreased by $27.2 million in FY25, mostly due to the completion of the new Medical Examiner's building. Overall, total County expenses increased by $14.1 million for FY25. Also, you can see from the bar line that is on the chart, that the County's net position, also referred to as its Reserves, is considerably higher than its current revenue or expenses. Most importantly, the County's overall net position increased in FY2025. The total net position for the County was $2.9 billion as of June 30, 2025, and it is important to note that not all of the net position balance was spendable, because at the end of FY2025, $2.7 billion was invested in capital assets. An additional $480 million was Restricted, which leaves a negative Unrestricted Balance of $301 million. This is primarily attributed to the County's pension liability, which was $547 million at the end of FY2025. Next slide please. Finally, I would like to highlight the County's federal expenditures that are presented each year and the single Audit Report. You can see from the table on the screen that the four largest federal agencies the County received federal grants for were from the Department of Treasury, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor and the Department of Homeland Security. You can see a decrease in federal expenditures for FY25. Again, nearly $52 million, primarily due to a reduction in the amount of COVID-19 pandemic monies the County received and spent, specifically from the Department of Treasury and the Department of Homeland Security. The County's Department of Treasury Programs, Emergency Rental Assistance Program, Coronavirus, State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds and Local Assistance and Tribal Consistency Fund all decreased by $9.2 million, $7.6 million and $7.9 million, respectively, from the previous year. In addition, the Department of Homeland Security programs, the Emergency Food and Shelter National Board Program decreased by $22.6 million and Shelter and Services Program expenditures decreased by $3.4 million. Next slide please. Vicki will now discuss the County's four current audit findings and the recommendations that we reported in FY2025 reports, as well as the County's progress on implementing recommendations from our prior year audit findings.

VF: Good evening, Madam Chair Allen, members, and County Administrator Lesher. My name is Victoria Fisher. Before we discuss the findings reported in the FY25 audits, we would like to acknowledge the County's process in correcting prior year findings. Our auditing standards require that we follow up on any prior year audit findings until they have been fully corrected, and in FY24, we reported two financial statement findings and four federal findings. The financial statement findings were related to Information Technology (IT) deficiencies. One of these IT findings was fully corrected, and the other was partially corrected, and we reported similar recommendations in ‘25 that I will discuss shortly. The four federal compliance findings were related to not accurately compiling its Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards, commonly known as the SEFA, and the County identified this finding as partially corrected, and we reported similar recommendations in ‘25. Also, did not perform all required monitoring of its subrecipients’ activities for compliance with award terms and program requirements. The County identified this finding as partially corrected. However, because we found no deficiencies in the programs we audited in FY25, we did not report a similar finding. There were also two federal reporting findings. They were related to lack of policies and procedures to perform an independent review and approval of reports prior to submitting them to the federal awarding agencies and not always reporting accurate information or retaining documentation to support the submitted reports. The County identified these findings as partially corrected, and we reported similar reporting recommendations in ‘25. Next slide please. Now, moving on to our FY2025 audit findings and recommendations. The report on internal control and compliance is where you will find the financial statement findings, along with the County's responses to them. The first financial statement finding 2025-01 identified deficiencies in the County's control procedures over IT systems and data that increase the risk of inadequate system and data protection. We found deficiencies over restricting access that helps ensure systems and data are accessed by users who have need. The access granted is appropriate and access is monitored and reviewed. We also found that securing IT systems and data that help prevent and detect and respond to instances of unauthorized access, or inappropriate access or use, manipulation, damage or loss to its IT systems and data. Next slide please. To correct this finding, we made five recommendations to the County. Make it a priority to develop and document comprehensive IT policies and procedures and ensure the procedures are consistently followed. Assign and regularly review employee user access for job role appropriateness. Review all other account access to confirm ongoing need and appropriateness. Strengthen authentication requirements across IT systems and provide ongoing IT security training to all employees on IT security, risk ,and responsibilities. This is a similar finding to the 2024-02 finding that was initially reported in FY24. The County reported it anticipates correcting this finding and implementing recommendations by December 31st of 2026. Next slide please. The second financial statement finding 2025-02, was reported by other auditors who audited the Pima County School Reserve Fund, a component unit of Pima County, included in Pima County's Annual Comprehensive Financial Report, in which we relied upon the other auditor's work over the Pima County School Reserve Fund. The other auditors found that the County's School Superintendent’s Office did not timely reconcile its School Reserve Funds, cash balances to the County Treasurer's balances, increasing the risk of ineffective management of school reserve resources and inaccurate financial reporting. Next slide please. To correct this finding, the other auditors made one recommendation to the County School Superintendents Office, to complete cash reconciliations timely, promptly research and resolve differences, and post any needed adjustments to the School Reserve or the County Treasurer's records. The County School Superintendent’s Office reported it corrected this finding, and implemented recommendations in December 2025. I will now go over the two federal compliance findings we reported in the Single Audit Report. Next slide please. The first federal finding 2025-01, we reported the County did not accurately compile its SEFA. As a result, the County's initially prepared SEFA contained errors, increasing the risk of misinforming those who rely on the SEFA. Specifically, the County understated total expenditures by nearly $3.9 million. Overstated total expenditures passed through to subrecipients by roughly $694,000.00, and excluded two pass-through entities totaling approximately $310,000.00. The County subsequently corrected these errors from the initial draft and resubmitted its corrected SEFA for audit. Next slide please. To correct this finding, we made two recommendations to the County. The first, to accurately prepare the SEFA by providing training on existing policies and procedures to perform detailed SEFA preparation steps and review the SEFA for accuracy prior to submitting it for audit. The second was to create and maintain comprehensive listing of federal funds recorded in its accounting system. This finding is similar to the prior year finding 2024-101, which was initially reported in FY2024. The County reported it anticipates correcting this finding and implementing recommendations by June 30, 2027. Next slide please. The second and final federal compliance finding 2025-102. We reported that the County's Grants Management and Innovation Department did not develop, document, or implement internal control procedures to monitor compliance with programs, reporting, and/or cash management requirements for the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, the WIOA cluster, the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery (CSLFR) Funds Program, and the Immunization Cooperative Agreements Program. For 13 of 17 reports we tested, we found the department did not perform an independent review and approval of reports prior to submitting them to the Federal Awarding Agency or pass-through grantor to ensure the reported expenditures were accurate, agreed to County records and contained only allowable expenditures. We found this for 9 of 9 WIOA monthly reconciliation reports we tested. Three of four CSLFR Funds, quarterly project and expenditure reports we tested, and one of four Immunization Cooperative Agreement programs, quarterly contract expenditure reports we tested. These quarterly reports are also used to request reimbursement from the federal agency. Now, despite the lacking internal control procedures, we did not find any inaccurate WIOA or Immunization Cooperative Agreements information reported incorrectly. For the CSLFR Funds, and the Immunization Cooperative Agreements programs we did identify noncompliance. For the CSLFR funds reports, we found the department did not retain documentation such as system reports, screenshots or queries to support the information it reported. And for the Immunization Cooperative Agreements programs, the department did not prepare and submit timely Immunization Bridge Access Program information to the federal agency for monitoring. Specifically, the department failed to submit the three quarterly certified expenditure reports by their required due dates in FY25 and instead submitted one report containing or covering all of the FY25 quarterly information. The noncompliance that we found in these two programs resulted in qualified opinions for the program's reporting compliance requirements. Next slide. To correct this finding, we made six recommendations to the County. Independently review and approve all federal reports, before submitting the reports to ensure the reported expenditures were accurate. Agree to County records and contain only allowable expenditures. Keep detailed supporting documentation such as system reports, screenshots, or queries related to the submitted reports, to ensure accurate and complete program information is reported. Submit the Immunization Cooperative Agreement reports by their quarterly due date. Follow County and federal requirements to retain all records relating to federal awards for a period of three years from the date of the submission of the reports. Implement policies and procedures to reform and document independent review and approval of all federal program reports, and finally, implement a tracking system to ensure timely submissions. This finding is similar to the prior year finding 2024-104 initially reported in FY24. The County reported it anticipates correcting this finding and implementing recommendations by June 30, 2027. Next slide please. I want to thank Madam Chair Allen, members and County Administrator Lesher for having us present our audit results today. I would also like to thank the County staff for their cooperation during the audits. We have had a really good working relationship with them, with management and staff. This completes our presentation for the FY25 audit results. Are there any questions that we can answer for you concerning our audits?

JA: Supervisor Heinz.

MH: Thank you, Chair Allen, and thank you all for your report. I am just curious. Given in 2025, there was, of course, in January, a change of administration at the federal level that greatly complicated federal grants and there were many changes in rules and just kind of all sorts of chaos going on at the federal level. How did you all navigate the audit of 2025 in light of some of those changing requirements, or I am just curious if how that impacted your ability to do the audit here for 2025?

KED: Yes, I can certainly. Thank you for your question. So, for the federal compliance audits, we use Office of Management and Budget. They issue compliance supplement and we audit in accordance with that. So, those rules are usually published a little prior to the start of the calendar year and were in effect for ‘25 as of, I believe, November of ‘24.

MH: Okay, great. Thank you.

JA: Supervisor Cano.

AC: Thank you, Chair Allen. I want to thank all members of the Auditor General's team, but especially General Perry, you have incredible responsibility, task, not just by statute, but by the legislature and two of us have spent some time on this dais there. We know the duties in front of you are vast and great. These efforts, the recommendations that you have suggested, of course, will be taken very seriously by this Board and, of course, by our County Administrator and I want to give a special thanks to our Finance team, who also works diligently to ensure that the work and the preparation that happens every single year, and in consecutive years for this particular report, that it is done with the utmost professionalism and integrity. And it goes both ways, and I am very pleased with the recommendations and staff's input as well, so that they can be implemented and thank you, General Perry.

LP: Thank you, Supervisor Cano.

JA: I would also like to extend my gratitude for the work that you have done. I think what is the word I am looking for, sort of uncovering issues and bringing forth recommendations is helpful, right? It is important and it is what needs to be done. So, I thank you for doing that. I also was sort of thinking about the years and the funding, like the unique situation in which we were found, which I think is comparable to other local governments and that in looking through some of the funds that Grants Management & Innovation Department (GMI) had at the time, it was a $203 million from the CSLFR funds, the $52.6 million for Humanitarian Aid so Pima County could care for and process the average of 1,100 people per day. Who were the legal Asylum seekers. The $45 million in Emergency Rental Assistance, ensuring that thousands did not become homeless or lose their homes. And that in implementing some of the requirements of that funding a lot of it was done through subrecipients and working with community partners. My question is, sort of given the totality of those funds, like that is a pretty remarkable amount of funds. Is what some of the recommendations that you are making, was it exceptional? Were we going through sort of pretty unusual or exceptional time? And I guess I am just wondering if there were lessons that were then learned from the sort of exceptional period of time with these enormous grants going through some different crises.

LP: Madam Chair, thank you for the question. I think there is always something to learn from audit findings, and I certainly appreciate administrative Lesher and the Finance team always taking those with open arms to improve the County. I do not know that we are in any different situation or maybe a better situation than we were in COVID. That was a tremendous influx of federal dollars into the state, into the counties, into local governments and so I think a lot of us learned a lot from that process. To Supervisor Heinz's question too, the federal requirements were changing probably by the day during the COVID pandemic and monies being rolled out starting in March of 2020 and trying to figure out from a governance position, how to distribute those monies in line with the federal requirements that were changing. So, I think that Pima County has evolved with that. I would say that the findings that we are seeing are not remarkable. They are pretty standard findings that we see in other entities with difficulties with the SEFA but I know you have got a Finance team that is on top of that, and moving forward to make corrections. So, I think that we all continue to look at the federal government and the monies coming out from the federal government and the requirements around those, and trying to be partners in that of understanding what those requirements are so that the County can follow those. And you are not in jeopardy of having questioned costs and having to repay the federal government. So, the four findings that we are talking about today, again, I think those are pretty typical that we see. The federal findings are a little bit unique in that these are programs that the County is managing but the financial statement findings, the IT controls, that is something that my auditors have been focusing on since 2016, because we know that that is a real risk for counties and local governments. So hopefully that answers your question.

JA: Thank you.

RS: Chair Allen?

JA: Supervisor Scott.

RS: Thank you. I also wanted to thank General Perry and Ms. Decker, Ms. Fisher, for your report tonight. I wanted to ask Ms. Lesher, we get a monthly financial update every month. We had one tonight during our study session. I am wondering if we could incorporate into the monthly financial update, a section where you and your team brief us on how you are following up on the recommendations from the Auditor General and her team. I think that would be instructive to the Board if that could be an addition to the monthly financial update.

JL: [Inaudible response]

RS: Thank you. Thank you, Chair Allen.

JA: Okay. Any further questions?

MH: I move that we, if I may, I would like to move that we accept the 2024-2025 report of the Auditor General.

JA: Seconded by Supervisor Allen. Discussion? All those in favor? Aye.

MH: Aye.

RS: Aye.

SC: Aye.

AC: Aye.

JA: Opposed? Item passes 5-0.